

## AAC Meeting Minutes: May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021

In attendance: Clint Smith, Sarah Roth, Lana Summers, Crystal Nourie, Derrek Drenckpohl, Janet Tulley, Soemer Simmons, Wendi Whitman, Amy Hurd, Jess Ray, Mindy Kinney, Amelia Noel-Elkins

- I. Chair's remarks
  - a. Clint is leading the meeting today in Jazmyn's absence.
  
- II. Secretary/Treasurer Report
  - a. Approval of minutes
    - i. Motion to approve by Clint, second by Lana.
  
- III. Old Business
  
- IV. New Business
  - a. Summer Meeting Schedule – Soemer
    - i. AAC's last scheduled meeting is May 20. Do we want to meet in the summer, and how do we want to meet? The council has usually had 2 meetings- one in June and one in July. Discussed Monday afternoons the best time for first year advisors. Department Preview meetings are scheduled for 2pm. Soemer looked at availability and scheduled meetings for Monday, June 28 and Monday, July 19.
  - b. Updates on Advisor Hiring – Amy/Wendi/Amelia
    - i. Multiple meetings have occurred since the last AAC meeting, including with the Deans. We know COB has the highest need, and they will search for Brent's replacement. They plan to search for the 3 positions all together.
    - ii. Had a meeting with the science departments. Physics would like a professional advisor. The Chemistry advisor has a small caseload. The total would be 186 between PHY and CHE. Biology could use some relief- Margaret Parker has a full NTT caseload and 58 advisees.
    - iii. Need to account for the enrollment ups and downs from department to department.
    - iv. It has been 15 years since we have done serious, systemic planning for academic advising. We want to get these positions hired, but we don't want to do anything so permanent that it would be counter to long-term systemic planning and priorities. Leaning towards a system of "floating" advisors that would be housed in University College, and would have a partial FTIC/Undeclared caseload as well as a specific, dedicated departmental caseload so the department could get some relief. This

would also help with the new advisors' training- they would get full General Education knowledge. This plan gives the departments relief and us time to help with planning for the future.

- v. Administrators don't want to speak about specific academic departments yet because it isn't finalized.
  - vi. Shared advisors would be current, experienced advisors and new advisors would be traditional UC advisors. This would take advantage of the current expertise.
  - vii. More details coming at the Advisor Town Hall event May 19.
  - viii. Currently, the #1 priority is advising caseloads, with other factors going into the mix.
  - ix. This model is specifically relief for advising- departments will be told that advisors should not be given additional/other tasks.
  - x. This process is moving quickly, and many details still need to be worked out.
    - 1. Where would these new advisors be housed? Want them embedded into the department, physically and/or virtually, but can't have 2 offices. Are they doing double duty on Preview? What will the application or hiring process look like? Are these date definite positions?
- c. General Education Revision – Amy/Wendi/Amelia
- i. 4 working groups underway discussing credit hours, categories, required courses, and learning objectives. This will continue throughout the summer. Hope to have a plan in the fall. Will ultimately need to be approved by Senate.
    - 1. Department/school advisors, first year advisors, faculty, administrators, and students (except in the summer) are all part of these groups.
    - 2. A lot of this work greatly impacts and involves the Registrar's Office.
  - ii. Rough draft of a structure will be shared with this group before it's shared with the larger advising community. Let's put it on the agenda for an upcoming meeting- it will take about 20 minutes to go through.
- d. Advising Planning Process – Amy/Wendi/Amelia
- i. Real need for systemic, long-term planning for academic advising at Illinois State. Look back at the founding documents for Academic Advising Council. One task force was created and the work completed in 2005, and then the steering committee/implementation group's report is out there too. <https://emas.illinoisstate.edu/aac/about/>

- ii. With the infusion of new funds into advising, need broader planning conversations. Elected advising representatives should give thought to how we want to approach this. Previously, a department chair was the chair of the council. Dani Lindsay and Katy Killian led the conversations about implementation.
- iii. There would be an invitation from the Provost for people to serve on this group. Discussions about structure. Should elected AAC representatives serve on the committee?
  - 1. Who should lead the group? Someone invested in academic advising or an outside person?
- iv. Tasks to consider for future planning - baseline academic advisor position description, how to calculate advising caseloads, evaluation/professional development expectations, etc.
- v. The working group discussed a short presentation that an advisor could share with their department. This would be changing that focus. This group will cease until we flesh out what a task force would do.
- vi. What does advising look like at Illinois State? Students are different now. Advising practices are different. We've done a lot of fixes at the implementation level, but our overall situation is very different now than it was 15 years ago.
- vii. A task force is likely warranted- what is the exact charge?
- viii. Previous work helped with campus-wide communication, outreach, and efforts. Built a much more interwoven community. Different environment now than what we had in 2005.
- ix. Staff Success Group has some overlap with this. Talked about some of the things- better evaluation forms, position descriptions. AP Council has had some of these conversations also. Want to connect the dots and make sure the efforts are communal and working towards similar goals, not duplicating efforts.
- x. Make a recommendation to the Provost about how the committee should be made up- doesn't have to mirror the 2005 model. Could use that as a starting place, but need to use current circumstances.
  - 1. Could view this as a "State of Advising" starting point.
- xi. Recommendation that someone unbiased, and outside advising, chair the task force.
- xii. The 2005 task force was appointed by the Provost and President.
  - 1. There would be a recommendation from AAC to the Provost that we create this task force. We are advisory to the Provost.
- xiii. 2006 steering committee was established to put 2005 recommendations into action.

- xiv. Membership needs to be broad and diverse. The chair needs to be a neutral party. Elected members of AAC should work on it. Get it to the Provost by July 1.
- xv. Want to make sure to have a balance of administrators and advisors from various departments that represent different types of student populations. The 2005 membership seems large and to have a lot of administrators- far more than advisors.
- xvi. Amelia offered to get a draft started that we can review over Teams and edit. This would help us distinguish how this process would be different from AAC- could see that the end result is that we establish a list of things AAC can work on.
  - 1. Move forward with initial phase of creating a document and reviewing it before we look at creating a task force.
- xvii. Elected advisors can talk to constituents about what the goals could be, want to make sure we have enough information.

#### V. Campus Solutions/Registration

- a. We need to revisit Degree Audit in Campus Solutions to see if the fixes worked. Some advisors have found the fixes helpful and are seeing fewer errors.
  - i. Fine Arts advisors have issues with required courses counting correctly, decimalized courses, and repeated courses. New plans seem to be working much better than old plans. Reaching out to Theresa or meeting with her is a good idea.
  - ii. Would need to carefully consider the wording before we start a PR campaign to get students to use Degree Audit.
  - iii. May work better for FTIC students than transfer students.
  - iv. Some advisors use Academic Requirements as a double-check to their forms, but don't introduce it to students.
  - v. How does the Registrar's staff feel about it? Their use of it is very important.
  - vi. Should we be concerned if a "shadow" advising planning document differs from the degree requirements in CS? There could be an issue with this approach. Typically work hand-in-hand, pretty rare occurrence that there is a problem- typically if there are issues, it's with transfer students.

#### VI. Committee Updates

- a. Assessment
  - i. Did not meet. Next meeting is Monday.
- b. Technology

- i. Moving forward with the idea of a central repository for advising technology. Will consult with PDT.
- ii. Requesting that AAC work on a complete registration calendar (registration and W/X timeline) for the upcoming year. Over the summer, work towards a plan. Mixed responses within the Tech committee about summer registration timeline options. Would want to get feedback from students too about how this last year went.
- iii. Summer registration time frame- it's better to separate sophomores from freshmen. Freshmen and sophomores have been combined in the past because of the timing of spring break.
- iv. Availability can be an issue with specific classes (BS-SMT, Math). Students often wait until their fall advising appointment to register for summer.
- v. Need to set a plan and maintain that plan for 2 years to see how it goes. The Registrar's Office needs enough lead time to prepare for it. They want advisement from AAC.
- vi. Other schools do fall and summer registration at the same time. We are the outlier. Would have 1 enrollment appointment for summer and fall. More students are now going to My to see registration related information.
  - 1. Recommend putting this as an action item for the next meeting. Reach out to our constituents to gather information and then can take action at the next meeting.
- vii. If the Registrar's staff doesn't have a preference for the timeline, recommendation to put together a survey to ask advising community and students what they want. The timing/process may cause more stress for students than we know- freshmen this year were trying to register right before finals.
- viii. W/X timeline is separate. This was discussed in Academic Affairs meeting- a few areas had some concerns, but majority felt strongly the later W/X timeline had benefits. Jess will present again and this would go to Senate for approval.
- c. Teacher Education
  - i. Meeting next week. Discussing fall plans.
- d. PDT
  - i. Meeting next week. End of Year Wrap-Up Tuesday.
- e. Mentoring & Connections
  - i. Coffee hour tomorrow morning. If you have ideas for fostering connections (particularly in July and after), please let Sarah know.
- f. AAC Awards Selection

- i. AAC will need to resume discussion about possibly expanding the awards. Would need to discuss this over the summer- flesh out what additional awards would look like, criteria, and budget. Possible action item for May 20 or June meeting.

VII. Student Representative Report

VIII. Other Business?

- a. Guidelines coming for when we recommend other websites to students that require they create a log-in and provide personal information (email, etc).
  - i. ISBE/ELIS account is a state agency so should be different, has been pre-vetted. Transferology should already have been approved as well.
  - ii. Conversations starting- will there be a “pre-approved” list we refer to before making a recommendation? Pam Walden will likely be the point of contact.

IX. Next meeting – May 20<sup>th</sup>

Submitted by:  
Sarah Roth  
May 13, 2021